DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 203 UD 016 172

TITLE An Evaluation of the Hartford, Connecticut Career Opportunities Program (COP).
INSTITUTION Connecticut Univ., Storrs. Educational Resources and Development Center.
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 112p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; *Career Opportunities; *College Programs; College School Cooperation; *Compensatory Education Programs; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Opportunities; Federal Programs; Higher Education; Low Income; Minority Groups; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut (Hartford); Education Professions Development Act; EPDA

ABSTRACT

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) has been operating in the Hartford, Connecticut Public Schools since the summer of 1970. It is a project federally funded under the Educational Professions Development Act. In brief, the program provided the funds for Hartford paraprofessionals to further their formal education. The education provided these community people would hopefully benefit both them and the students with whom they came in contact. The project was due to expire at the end of August 1975. In November 1974, the Educational Resources and Development Center of the University of Connecticut was contacted and later contracted by the Connecticut State Department of Education, to conduct an evaluation of the Hartford Career Opportunities Program. On the basis of the data gathered and analyses performed, this evaluation concludes that the Hartford Career Opportunities Program has substantially achieved its goals. It is recommended that the Hartford Board of Education should make every effort to continue or renew the COP goals and approach. The University of Hartford should consider institutionalizing some of the aspects of the COP teacher training. (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126203

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AN EVALUATION OF THE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM (COP)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Educational Resources and Development Center
School of Education
University of Connecticut

July, 1975

UD016172

HARTFORD CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Donald Summers, Director

HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

John Shea, Acting Superintendent
Edith Gaines, Superintendent, July 1, 1975

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Irving Starr, Dean

James LeSure, Assistant Dean

John Stinson, COP College Coordinator

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Anthony Tedeschi, State COP Coordinator

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION/DHEW
Jewell C. Chambers, Regional COP Project Officer

THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Herbert H. Sheathelm, Director

Evaluation Team

Theodore Sergi, Evaluation Coordinator

Janice Baker

William Lopes

Herbert H. Sheathelm

Acknowledgements

A number of people have aided in the preparation of this report, including the large number of respondents who took a great deal of their time to complete the evaluation instruments. The Educational Resources and Development Center would like to thank these respondents as well as the offices of: Mr. Don Summers, COP Director; Mr. Robert Nearine, Director of Research and Evaluation, Hartford Public Schools; and Dean Irving Starr, School of Education, University of Hartford. All of these individuals played an active role in assisting this evaluation effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Introduction	1
Background Information	3
Career Opportunities Program Participants	16
Presentation of Data and Analysis	21
Structured Interview Responses	65
Summary and Conclusions	77
Recommendations	83
Appendices	84
Appendix A. Hartford COP Evaluation Questionnaire	84
Appendix B. Hartford COP Evaluation Attitude Survey	93

INTRODUCTION

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) has been operating in the Hartford, Connecticut, Public Schools since the summer of 1970. It is a federally funded project, under the Educational Professions Development Act (EPDA). In brief, the program provided the funds for Hartford paraprofessionals to further their formal education. The education provided these community people would hopefully benefit both them and the students with whom they came in contact. The project is due to expire at the end of August, 1975.

In November of 1974 the Educational Resources and Development Center (ERDC) of the University of Connecticut was contacted and later contracted by the Connecticut State Department of Education, (CSDE) to conduct an evaluation of the Hartford Career Opportunities Program. Meetings of representatives from the CSDE, the Hartford Board of Education, the U.S. Office of Education and the ERDC produced an evaluation design and instruments. The agreed upon design and instruments were basically those previously prepared by the Northeast Education Associates of Tewksbury, Massachusetts. This "Program Evaluation Design" had been prepared in the Spring of 1974 and was slated for use in all three Massachusetts COP projects and was to be included by other New England COP projects, where possible.

Part of the Northeast Education Associates design called for all the various categories of personnel involved in COP, to complete a series of questionnaires. These questionnaires were adapted for use in the Hartford COP evaluation. The questionnaires were only modified for ease of response and clarity. It was felt there were some areas of concern not dealt with by the questionnaires. Therefore, an attitude survey was added to complete the package of instruments. This survey or opinionnaire was very much based on that used in the Final Report for Year IV of the Lewiston, Maine, Career Opportunities Program, 1973-74. These two instruments along with some structured interviews were agreed on as the basic evaluation tools.

The design also included a review of COP documents produced throughout the five year history of the project. This review provided the necessary information for the preparation of a background section as well as an analysis of COP participants' vital statistics.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Hartford and Its Schools

Hartford, the capitol of the State of Connecticut, is located in the very center of the state. It is a city of slightly over one-hundred and fifty thousand residents and is 19.2 square miles in area. The city has experienced a period of steady economic growth over the last decade. It is the insurance center of the nation and also contains a variety of manufacturing concerns.

In spite of this prosperity, Hartford has been a growing community of low-income people. The inner city is encircled by affluent, white collar class suburbs. Hartford, like other United States urban areas, has not been able to provide employment for its now unskilled work force. Poverty and unemployment statistics over the last five years show increasing problems for Hartford and its residents. In addition, population mobility statistics for the last decade show a highly transient populace. The net effect of this is to leave Hartford with more economically depressed families. This influx of new residents has brought a substantial number of immigrants from Puerto Rico. The typical new immigrant family brings to Hartford more school age children than did the family which moved to the suburbs. Typically, too, these children have more educational problems, and these are reflected by lower achievement scores, serious

language disabilities and severe adjustment problems.

The table below shows the change in Hartford Public School enrollments by racial/ethnic groups, over the last decade.

	Percentage of Total Pupil Enrollment		
	Black	Spanish-Speaking	White & Other
1965	38%	6.8%	55.2%
1970	46%	16%	38%
1974	50.6%	23.2%	26.2%

Despite the city's on-going attempts to provide quality integrated education for all its youngsters, Hartford is rapidly becoming a predominately non-white community. Enrollments in the elementary districts run the gamut from virtually 100% non-white to 92% white. This is despite an internal busing program which has been trying to help to integrate all of the schools in Hartford.

The Hartford Public School System has had a total enrollment of between twenty-eight and twenty-nine thousand pupils over the last five years. Hartford is the largest school district in the state and also has one of the highest per pupil expenditures in Connecticut. There are presently approximately 1500 teachers and 500 paraprofessionals in Hartford schools. In 1969 there were only 247 paraprofessionals employed by Hartford. As much as there has been a great effort to recruit minority teachers, 1974 statistics show a distribution of 75%

white, 19% Black and 6% Spanish-speaking. This 25% minority employment is a substantial increase over similar 1969 figures. In addition, the vast majority of paraprofessionals are minority people and residents of Hartford.

As in other urban areas, Hartford underwent three consecutive years of damaging racial conflict in the mid nineteen sixties. It was judged that there was a failure of the education system to provide Hartford residents with the education they needed to increase their socio-economic status.

All of the above provided the atmosphere in which Hartford COP was born. The Hartford Board of Education was very aware of the following two critical needs: a) the need to improve relations with the predominantly non-white community it served; b) the need to increase the number of Black and Spanish-speaking personnel in the classrooms. COP met both of these needs.

Career Opportunities Program in Hartford

In June of 1969 a national COP conference was held in Washington, D.C. at the United States Office of Education. From this period on a number of discussions were held by and with the Hartford Board of Education, the University of Hartford School of Education, the Connecticut State Department of Education, and two community agencies; the Community Renewal Team and the Model Cities Educational Task Force.

In September, 1969, a Steering Committee was formed, which included representatives of all the organizations listed above. The Steering Committee was responsible for the preparation of the November 28, 1969 submission of the Formal Project Application. The Steering Committee also assisted in the selection of the COP Director and recruitment of COP participants. Members of the Steering Committee were later absorbed into the COP Advisory Council.

The following objectives for the Hartford Career Opportunities Program were stated in the 1969 proposal:

1. To provide better education for Hartford's children by having a direct input from community people, with whom the children can relate and identify, into the classroom.

2. To provide education for indigenous, low-income people who previously lacked the means, so as to enable them to advance to a level at which they feel comfortable, with the ultimate possibility of graduating as a professional teacher, nurse, social worker or librarian.

3. To successfully extend our career lattice plan so as to provide both the experience and academic training necessary to enable people from low-income areas to enter the field of education. This program, in addition to providing meaningful employment opportunities, will also include intermediate achievement points from which the trainees can work as full-time paraprofessionals until they are ready to continue preparation for a higher position or make a horizontal move into a related field. This will contribute to their own self-fulfillment and will meet some of Hartford's crucial social needs.

4. To improve school-community relations by involving members of the target community in making decisions about and in the operation of the program.

Specifically, this will be accomplished by their present participation in the Steering Committee which developed this proposal and in their future participation on the Screening Committee which will select participants and assist in the on-going evaluation of the program.

5. To encourage greater participation of parents in education via the new personnel who will also serve as school-community liaisons.

6. To assist teachers, through the use of indigenous supportive personnel, in developing the ability to engage in an honest dialogue with urban youth, adults, and with other personnel working with city residents.

7. To enhance teachers' abilities to work with community agencies which might assist in advancing the effectiveness of the present integration programs.

8. To maintain and expand the present Youth Tutoring Youth Program which serves as the first step on the Career Lattice and will hopefully motivate youngsters into entering the field of education by providing early goals which are attainable and a partial source of income.

9. To establish through the COP program a new source of teachers who, as a result of being indigenous to the area, will serve as models to the students and who will be better equipped (through familiarity with local problems) to meet existing needs. These would include Black, white, and Puerto Rican personnel.

10. To provide students from target areas with more individualized education which is relevant to their needs, interests, and life experiences.

11. To recruit as many veterans as possible into the COP program who, in addition to providing many other valuable services, will also serve as models for the male youth in the target area.

12. To secure commitments from other local colleges and universities which will be compatible to the present one exemplified by the mutually committed relationship that exists between the University of Hartford and the Hartford Board of Education. This will eventually broaden the career lattice by providing areas of specialization not presently included in the University of Hartford's curriculum. At the time of this drafting, extensive discussions were being carried out with several of the surrounding schools of higher education.

13. To implement training courses geared to the trainees' immediate life situation that will enable their education to proceed from the particular known reference to more general understanding.

14. To develop staff, materials, and criteria which will provide a basis for additional curriculum changes in the higher institutions of learning.

15. To further expand the concept of the team-teaching approach, by utilizing on-site school personnel in the training.

The "Career Lattice" concept was an integral part of COP. The 1969 Formal Project Application described the career lattice as follows:

> Paraprofessionals employed in the fields of adult education, guidance, library service, physical education, school health services, social work, and in elementary and secondary education may advance in their careers through a four-level career lattice plan.
>
> In each area, the levels are designated as: Level I, Aide; Level II, Assistant; Level III, Associate; Level IV, Intern. Level V advances the careerist from the paraprofessional to the professional level as a certified teacher.

> Advancement in salary for the paraprofessional is based upon education, in-service training, special courses, and longevity. Fringe benefits, included at all levels, include Blue Cross and C.M.S., major medical insurance, free life insurance, optional dental insurance, leave for illness and personal reasons, severance pay for unused sick leave.
>
> A paraprofessional is hired at Level I with or without a high school diploma and less than one full year of college. He may advance to Level II with one year of college, to Level III with two years of college and to Level IV with three years of college. Advancement to Level I means completion of four years of college and certification. Each level includes a three-step advancement schedule for years of service.
>
> In Hartford's COP program there is opportunity for vertical mobility in instruction and for horizontal and diagonal transfer as need exists in other fields or work such as guidance and library services.

The Hartford COP project was never able to fully develop the career lattice described above. Hartford's enrollees have mostly been involved in elementary education with a few in secondary education. Hartford COP established more of a career ladder than a career lattice. Clearly, there was a need for extra funding if the entire career lattice was to be constructed.

The Hartford Board of Education had entered into a contract with the Hartford Paraprofessionals Association, prior to COP. This contract provided many of the professional rights given Hartford teachers and administrators. The contract also established the levels of paraprofessional work described above.

At any one time there were approximately 100 participants in the Hartford COP project. These participants were paraprofessionals in the Hartford Public Schools. Only a handful of enrollees were assigned to secondary schools with the remainder serving in elementary schools. Participants attended the University of Hartford for their formal training. Most classes were held in the late afternoon, evening, as well as during the summer session.

The COP staff consisted of a Director and a secretary who actually functioned as an executive assistant. The individuals presently in these positions have been serving in their respective capacities since the program began. The Director was directly responsible to an Assistant Superintendent of the Hartford Public Schools and in turn to the Superintendent and Hartford Board of Education. The Dean of the School of Education at the University of Hartford and an Assistant Dean have been responsible for COP participants' activities at the university. For the first three years of the program, there was a part-time college coordinator who assisted COP participants with their university program. In 1973 a full-time COP College Coordinator was appointed by the University of Hartford. The group charged with coordinating all COP activities was the COP Advisory Council.

A permanent COP Advisory Council was formed consisting of representatives from the Model Cities Neighborhoods, Head Start and Follow Through Supplementary Training, the New Careers Educational Program, Model Cities Educational Task Force, the State Department of Education, the University of Hartford, and the Hartford Board of Education. This council had a greater than 50% membership from the Model Cities Neighborhoods, and was responsible for the screening and selection of applicants. They were also involved in deciding university course content and advising and evaluating the COP program throughout its duration. This was done throughout the life of the project by regular monthly meetings. The Advisory Council was an outgrowth of the COP Steering Committee which was responsible for the preparation and submission of the 1969 proposal. The makeup of the Steering Committee was very similar to and served as the foundation for the membership of the Advisory Council.

Over the last five years the federal grant which supported Hartford COP has averaged $200,000 per fiscal year. The bulk of these funds were used to pay tuition, fees and expenses of enrollees attending the University of Hartford. Another substantial amount of these funds was given directly to participants as stipends for and while attending summer school. The stipend averaged around $80 per week for the length

of the university summer session. The Connecticut State Labor Department expended between $80,000 and $100,000 per year over the last five years on the Youth Tutoring Youth Program attached to Hartford COP. These funds went to pay the wages of the student tutors. The Hartford Board of Education incurred the expense of the regular school year salary of those paraprofessionals who were also COP participants. These expenditures totaled between $350,000 and $500,000 per year. They should not be considered a cost of the COP project.

The program at the University of Hartford was cooperatively devised by the Steering Committee and the University of Hartford School of Education. The program began with remedial and basic skills instruction, which were conducted during the summer of 1970. The program included liberal arts courses, professional education courses and on the job training. Enrollees beginning their study with no previous college credit could complete the Bachelor of Science program in four to five years. The system was designed so that participants could complete 30 credits of work per year, including summer study. Enrollees were granted credit for previous college course work. At the beginning of their program they were encouraged to make tentative career goal selections in terms of three levels of preparation:

1. Certificate - 30 credits
2. Associate Degree - 58 credits
3. Bachelors Degree - 124 credits

COP participants took almost all their courses with the other regular undergraduate students.

Recruitment of participants was handled by the Steering Committee and Advisory Council of COP. The Advisory Council and Director were responsible for the final selection of participants. There was an effort to recruit a substantial number of veterans and a representative number of Spanish-speaking personnel. With the exception of veterans, the greatest source of recruits was the large pool of already employed paraprofessionals. Guidelines were set for the selection of participants. The individual was to be: 1) a paraprofessional working in the Hartford schools, 2) a resident of the city of Hartford, 3) a "high risk" (see below), 4) interested in working with minority students, 5) highly motivated, 6) committed to the program. "High Risk" people were defined by national COP as "people who by reason of academic record, family background and a history of acting out their resentment of their life conditions in juvenile delinquency, crime, drugs, and alcoholism, have never found the opportunity for constructive growth or self realization. Through COP they can get the chance to develop their full potential". Veterans were high priority participants for COP because "they represent one of the most valuable man-power resources in the United States today, particularly in

human services. Their service experience gives veterans breadth, depth, discipline and leadership qualities. Moreover, male veterans from low income backgrounds can help fill the void caused by the absence of a male image in the experiences of many low income youngsters". An analysis of all individuals that participated in COP is presented in the next major section.

There has been one formal evaluation of the Hartford COP project prior to the present study. In 1972 the Abt Associates of Boston, Massachusetts conducted a number of interviews with personnel involved in the project. Two major problems were identified by this evaluation: 1) the need for a full time COP College Coordinator to provide supportive services to participants, and 2) the need for release time from their paraprofessional duties for participants to fulfill their academic responsibilities.

Youth Tutoring Youth (YTY) has been an auxiliary enterprise of the COP project. In this program, high school students were recruited and trained to tutor elementary students. The YTY program has been run each school year and summer for the past five years. The program was operated at four centrally located scholls and each had fifteen to twenty tutors and a corresponding number of tutees. The program was conceived as the first step in the education career lattice. COP funds provided salaries for the four

center supervisors as well as monies for materials and supplies. The YTY program was not evaluated as a part of this evaluation.

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Over the past five years Hartford COP has enrolled a total of one-hundred and thirty-four individuals. As participants graduated or left the program they were replaced by other eligible paraprofessionals from the Hartford Public School System. Each year, the number of enrollees was approximately one-hundred.

The age of COP participants has ranged from twenty to fifty-nine with a mean of thirty-five and one-half years. This was their average age at the time of entering COP, which in most cases was June, 1970.

Of the one-hundred and thirty-four persons in the program, one-hundred and seventeen have been female (87%) and seventeen have been male (13%).

The program has had ninety-six Black female participants, eleven Spanish-speaking females, and ten White females. There have been sixteen Black males and one Spanish-speaking male enrolled. Of the seventeen males that have been participants, twelve were veterans.

The mean education of participants prior to entering COP was approximately one semester of college credit or 13.5 credits. Six of the participants had not obtained a high school diplomas prior to COP. Another forty-five enrollees had received a high school diploma but had no college experience before the program began. Only one participant completed the equivalent

of three years of college education, while three other participants had finished between two and three years of college. The majority of COP enrollees had completed between zero and thirty credits of college course work prior to COP.

The total sample of one-hundred and thirty-four individuals, who have at some time been enrolled in COP, can be divided into three sub-samples:

A. Those who left the program.

B. Those who graduated from the program.

C. Those who are still enrolled in the program.

Left the Program

A. There have been thirty-seven individuals who left the COP program. The following reasons were given for their departure:

# of Participants	Reason
5	Maternity
5	Dropped by Advisory Council
4	Health
4	Moved
4	Personal
3	Left employ of Hartford Public Schools
3	Financial constraints
2	Continue education
2	Leave of absence
1	Language barrier
1	Return to military
1	Course work too difficult
1	Religious conflict
1	Retired

The average age of this group was 33.5 years. These 37 participants completed a mean level of education of 25.7 college credits. Included in this is a 5.6 credit mean education prior to entering COP, indicating that these enrollees completed a little more than one semester of college study while active COP participants.

Twenty-one Black females, 7 Spanish-speaking females and 2 White females have left the program. This represents 26% of those females who began the program. Six Black males and 1 Spanish-speaking male have left COP. This represents 41% of the males who began the program. In addition, these figures indicate that 67% of the Spanish-speaking participants first enrolled have left COP.

Graduated

There have been 26 graduates from the Hartford COP project. They have all received a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Education degree from the University of Hartford. These 26 included 18 Black females and 4 White females, or a total of 19% of the females who began the program. Four Black males have graduated from the project, representing 24% of the 17 males who began COP.

The average age of this group, at entrance into COP, was 35.9 years. The prior education of graduates was between two and three semesters of college study or 40.3 credits.

Of this group, 18 (69%) are presently teaching in the Hartford Public Schools. Four others were June 1975 graduates

who anticipate employment in Hartford but as yet have no definite plans. One graduate is presently teaching in Glastonbury, Connecticut, while another is employed in a Hartford area industrial firm. The whereabouts of the remaining member of this group is unknown.

Four of these participants received honors upon their graduation, including 2 cum laudes, 1 magna cum laude and 1 summa cum laude. In addition, six of the COP graduates have begun graduate study while maintaining their full-time teaching positions.

Currently Enrolled

As of June 1975, 71 participants were still enrolled in the COP project. Twelve of these individuals have a good chance of graduating with a B.S. degree by the end of the program. (August 1975). This depends on the successful completion of their summer studies and would bring the total number of graduates to 38. Another 12 participants are within one semester to one year of completing their B.S. program. The following table summarizes the present status of the 71 remaining participants.

# of Participants	Present Status
12	Anticipated graduation, August, 1975
12	Completed 3 to 4 years of college
26	Completed 2 to 3 years of college
17	Completed 1 to 2 years of college
4	Completed less than 1 year of college

The average age of this group was 36.6 years old, at entrance into COP. Their prior education was an average of 7.8 college credits or approximately one half a semester.

Of this group, 5 participants have been awarded an associate degree.

The following table summarizes some of the previous information.

	Total Sample	Left COP	Graduated	Still Enrolled
Black Females	96	21	18	57
Spanish-Speaking Females	11	7	0	4
White Females	10	2	4	4
Black Males	16	6	4	6
Spanish-Speaking Males	1	1	0	0
TOTALS	134	37	26*	71
Percent of Total		28%	19%*	53%
Mean Education Prior to COP (in college credits)	13.5	5.6	40.3	7.8
Mean Age at Entrance into COP	35.6	33.5	35.9	36.6

* Anticipated August 1975 graduation of 12 more participants would yield a total of 38 graduates or 28% of all participants.

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS

A. Procedure

The questionnaire and attitude survey, both previously described, made up the instrument by which data was gathered from respondents.

The vast majority of instruments were distributed to Hartford Public School employees through the office of Mr. Robert Nearine, Director of Research and Evaluation, Hartford Public Schools. The completed instruments were returned through school principals to Mr. Nearine's office. Questionnaires and surveys completed by University of Hartford faculty were distributed and collected through the office of Dean Irving Starr, School of Education. All completed instruments were forwarded to the Educational Resources and Development Center for analysis.

Respondents were asked to identify their role in the project as:

PARTICIPANT

1. Presently enrolled
   or
2. Graduate
   or
3. No longer enrolled
4. Cooperating teacher
5. School Principal
6. University Faculty

In addition, some selected administrative personnel were asked to complete the entire instrument. These included the COP Director, IHE Coordinator, the Dean and Assistant Dean

of the IHE - School of Education, and public school central office administrators.

Mean scores and percentages were calculated for the total population and most sub-groups. Two sub-groups, no longer enrolled COP participants (N=3) and administrative staff (N=5), were considered too small for separate analysis. The returns of both groups are included in the total population scores.

B. Sample

The following table describes the respondent sample.

Sub-Group	# of instruments sent out	# of instruments completed	Percent return
Participants	84	65	77%
Presently Enrolled		46	
Graduate		16	
No Longer Enrolled		3	
Cooperating Teachers	90	40	44%
School Principals	29	19	65%
University Faculty	32	15	47%
Administrators	6	5	83%
TOTAL POPULATION	241	144	60%*

The length of the instrument (12 pages) may have had a detrimental effect on the number and percentage of returns. In addition, University faculty received the instrument at the close of the spring semester, which may have reduced the number of returns.

Twenty-four instruments were returned unanswered. Most of these were from cooperating teachers and university faculty, who felt they were not in a position to take part in the evaluation. The most frequently stated reason for not completing the questionnaires was that the individual's involvement with (and/or knowledge of) COP was very limited.

---

* Counting the 24 additional unanswered but returned instruments, the rate of return increases to 70 percent.

C. Questionnaire

The first part of the information gathered from respondents was their completion of a seven part (A-G) questionnaire. The directions which respondents received to complete each section, are presented with the data.

Items have been arranged to reflect their mean score ranking. However, each item has retained its original item number. Please note that respondents were often asked to complete two tasks in answering some parts of the questionnaire.

A discussion follows each of the seven parts. In the discussions, the data are summarized, and inter-item and/or sub-group differences are highlighted.

Mean scores are given for the total population response to each part, while Appendix A (Parts A-F) contains mean scores by sub-group.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A:

Certain characteristics have been identified as evidencing successful COP programs. Please circle the relative weight as determiners of success which should be given to the statements below. Add others which you feel to be appropriate measures of success. Also, circle the E for those which were evident in your project.

No Weight 1	Little Weight 2	Moderate Weight 3	Great Weight 4	Very Great Weight 5

Item #*	Mean Score**	Percent indicating item was evident in Hartford COP
4. COP program has provided a vehicle for the upward mobility of aides.	4.5	41%
1. COP participants show strong motivation to continue in the program and become teachers.	4.3	57%
2. COP participants have a positive professional view of themselves.	4.2	48%
8. COP program has resulted in gains for low-income and minority students in their learning, behavior, attitudes, and aspirations.	4.1	29%
3. COP participants are representative of the minority population.	4.0	42%
6. COP program has caused existing personnel to be trained for new roles.	3.6	31%
5. COP program has caused changes in the ways schools have utilized personnel.	3.5	35%
9. COP program has caused changes in the organization and structure of the Public Schools.	3.3	20%
7. COP program has resulted in changes in other preparation programs within the University.	3.2	16%

*Items have been arranged to reflect their mean score ranking.
**Part A of Appendix A shows mean scores by sub-group.

Discussion of Questionnaire: Part A

Part A was completed by all the groups previously described. It asked respondents to indicate the weight they would assign to each of nine items as determiners of a successful COP program.

All nine items received mean scores of moderate or greater weight. Items 4, 1, and 2, which were ranked first, second and third respectively, reflect the relationship between COP and its participants. The effect of COP on students (item #8) was ranked fourth most important. It was also felt that COP participants should be representative of the minority population (item #3). All of the above were given mean scores of great to very great weight.

Items 6, 5, 9, and 7 were considered of secondary importance and received slightly lower scores than the above. These items were representative of the effect COP has on established institutions and practices such as personnel training and utilization, school organization and university-teacher preparation programs. These four items received scores of moderate to great weight.

Differing from the mean, university faculty felt that the most critical item in gauging success should be the resulting gains for low income and minority students (item #8). University faculty also rated item #7, changes in preparation programs within the university, much higher than other groups.

School principals, comparatively, ranked items 5, 7, 8, and 9 much lower. Item 9, changes in the organization and structure of the Public Schools, as scored by school principals, received the lowest score in this part of the questionnaire. In general, COP participants and graduates scored all items with a greater weight than did the other three groups. All groups saw items 6, 5, 9 and 7 as being least important as determiners of success.

Respondents were also asked to indicate which of these elements were present in Hartford COP. Responses to this section were very limited, indicating the possibility that many respondents failed to recognize this second task of Part A. In general, those items ranked as least important as determiners of success were also found to be less evident in the Hartford COP project. Item #8 which referred to student gains is the one determiner of success whose rank order of importance did not match its evidence in Hartford. This probably indicates the problems of measuring those gains.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART B:

Please circle the importance to you, of the COP goals listed below. Also, indicate your perception of the achievement of each goal in your project.

None	Little	Moderate	Great	Very Great
1	2	3	4	5

Item #*	Mean Scores** Goal Importance	Goal Achievement
1. To provide education for indigenous, low-income people who previously lacked the means, so as to enable them to advance to a level at which they feel comfortable, with the ultimate possibility of graduating as a professional teacher.	4.6	4.1
2. To successfully establish a career lattice plan so as to provide both the experience and academic training necessary to enable people from low-income areas to enter the field.	4.6	4.0
6. To establish through the COP program a new source of teachers who, as a result of being indigenous to the area, will serve as models to the students and who will be better equipped (through familiarity with local problems) to meet existing needs.	4.4	3.8
4. To assist teachers, through the use of indigenous supportive personnel, in developing the ability to engage in an honest dialogue with urban youth, adults and with other personnel working with city residents.	4.1	3.7

*Items have been arranged to reflect their mean score ranking.
**Part B of Appendix A shows mean scores by sub-group.

PART B: continued

None	Little	Moderate	Great	Very Great
1	2	3	4	5

Item #*	Mean Scores** Goal Importance	Goal Achievement
3. To improve school-community relations by involving members of the target community in making decisions about and in the operation of the program.	4.1	3.6
7. To bring about change in the pre-service Teacher Preparation programs.	4.1	3.6
5. To maintain and expand the present Youth Tutoring Youth Program which serves as the first step on the Career Lattice and will hopefully motivate youngsters into entering the field of education by providing early goals which are attainable and a partial source of income.	4.0	3.2

Discussion of Questionnaire: Part B

Part B was completed by all of the groups previously described. Respondents were asked to rate the importance and achievement of seven goals of COP. These seven goals were extracted from the original statement of objectives in the 1969 Hartford COP proposal.

Respondents scored all seven goals as great to very great in importance. The emphasis was obviously on the participant. Those items which were scored the highest (#1 and #2), deal directly with what COP does for its participants. The lowest ranked goals (and yet still with great importance scores) were those which might be considered indirect benefits of COP (i.e., improve school-community relations, effect on teacher preparation programs, maintain and expand the Youth Tutoring Youth program).

The sample saw Hartford's goal achievement in the same rank order as that of goal importance. Again, those items dealing with COP as a means for indigenous and low income people to advance themselves were viewed as having the greatest success. Moderate to great scores were given the other goals of influencing students, teachers, the community and the university.

The goal importance section produced a great deal of agreement among the sub-groups. Agreement was especially high on items #1 and #2 which were ranked as greatest in importance and achievement. In all groups, for all items, goal importance was at least at the great importance level.

COP participants and graduates generally ranked all goals higher in importance than did cooperating teachers, school principals, and university faculty.

Likewise, the latter three groups perceived Hartford COP's goal achievement as less than that perceived by participants and graduates. The difference between these two combined groups was approximately that of a moderate score compared to a great score. All groups saw the least achievement in item #5, the maintenance and expansion of the Youth Tutoring Youth program.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART C:

A goal of COP is to bring about change as a result of its activities. Please circle the extent of the COP program impact on the items below.

No Impact	Little Impact	Moderate Impact	Great Impact	Very Great Impact
1	2	3	4	5

Item #*	Mean Score**
5. Participants	4.2
1. Pupils	3.8
12. Methods of Instruction	3.8
11. Classroom Organization	3.8
7. University	3.8
13. In-service training	3.7
4. Parents	3.7
6. Community	3.7
10. Public Schools	3.7
2. Teachers	3.6
8. Teacher Certification	3.5
9. Admissions Standards	3.4
3. Administration	3.4
14. Legislation	2.9

*Items have been arranged to reflect their mean score ranking.
**Part C of Appendix A shows mean scores by sub-group.

Discussion of Questionnaire: Part C

Part C was completed by all groups previously described. It asked respondents to indicate their perceptions of the impact of COP program has had.

The results substantiate the thought that Hartford COP's greatest impact has been on its participants. Secondly, it has had a more than moderate impact on those people, institutions and processes that participants have come in direct contact with. Lastly, they have had less impact on legislation relating to teacher preparation. The impact appears to decrease as one gets further away from the daily work of participants.

In general, cooperating teachers, school principals and university faculty saw the impact of COP as less than that perceived by COP participants and graduates. On the other hand, few sub-group scores dipped below the moderate impact level. All groups saw the greatest impact as that on the participant (item #5), while all groups saw legislation (item #14) as the least affected by COP. University faculty, COP participants and graduates viewed the program as having a great impact on inservice training (item #13), but cooperating teachers and school principals saw only a moderate impact on this subject. COP graduates gave scores slightly lower than COP participants in almost all items. Likewise, school principals perceived the impact oc COP as somewhat less than that perceived by cooperating teachers.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART D:

An anticipated product of COP is positive impact on pupils' interaction with COP participants. Please circle the degree to which the presence of a COP Trainee or COP trained teacher has had such a positive effect.

No Effect	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	Great Effect	Very Great Effect
1	2	3	4	5

Item #*	Mean Score** COP Trainee	COP Trained Teacher
4. Improved self-image	3.9	4.3
8. Improved educational aspirations	3.7	4.2
7. Improved socialization in classroom	3.7	4.1
3. Improved attitude toward school	3.7	4.0
2. Reduction in discipline problems	3.6	4.0
6. Improved school grades	3.4	3.8
5. Improved school attendance	3.3	3.8
1. Improved performance on achievement tests.	3.3	3.7

*Items have been arranged to reflect their mean score ranking.
**Part D of Appendix A shows mean scores by sub-group.

Discussion of Questionnaire: Part D

Part D was completed by all groups previously described. A very small percentage of university faculty completed this part and therefore no separate analysis of their scores appears in Appendix A - Part D. This part was concerned with the impact Hartford COP has had on pupils.

The scores for COP Trainees (paraprofessionals) ranged between moderate to great effect, with highest scores given to what may be called affective gains (i.e., self-image, aspirations, socialization and attitude toward school). Rated below these were the more cognitive outputs of grades and achievement test results, as well as the areas of discipline and attendance. Overall, COP Trained Teachers were found to have slightly greater impact on pupils than COP Trainees. The difference between Trained Teachers and Trainees (approximately +.4) was very stable over all items. The eight items were ranked in the same order for both Trainees and Trained Teachers.

Cooperating teachers consistently saw both Trainees and Trained Teachers as having less of an effect than that stated by other groups. School principals generally scored the impact higher than cooperating teachers and yet lower than COP participants and graduates. Interestingly, school principals scored COP Trained Teachers considerably higher than they did COP Trainees. COP graduates saw very little difference between

Trainess and Trained Teachers. However, COP participants viewed Trained Teachers as definitely having a greater effect on pupil behavior. With the exception of cooperating teacher scores for impact on grades, test scores and attendance, all other scores showed COP having approximately a moderate to great effect.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART E:

People have identified many different attributes of a COP program. Please circle your judgement as to whether the condition should exist as a result of the COP program and as to whether the condition actually exists in your project.

Not at All	To a Little Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Large Extent	To a Very Large Extent
1	2	3	4	5

Item #*	Mean Scores** Should Exist	Actually Exists
9. Training of talented people who would otherwise not be trained.	4.6	4.3
1. Pupils receive more individualized help.	4.5	4.1
10. Provides the children with a person with whom they can identify.	4.4	4.1
3. Teachers are helped to provide a greater variety of activities.	4.4	3.8
8. Results in better use of time in classroom.	4.4	3.8
4. COP participants are able to relate theory to actual situations.	4.1	3.8
7. Makes teaching more rewarding.	4.1	3.7
2. Teachers are relieved of non-teaching jobs.	4.1	3.4
5. Teachers have more time for planning.	4.1	3.4
6. Teachers relate better to the neighborhood.	4.0	3.4

*Items have been arranged to reflect their mean score ranking.

**Part E of Appendix A shows mean scores by sub-group.

Discussion of Questionnaire: Part II

All groups, except University faculty, completed this part of the questionnaire. It dealt with attributes of a COP program that respondents felt should exist and did exist in Hartford.

In the "should exist" category, all ten items received a mean score which indicated that each was considered an ideal attribute to a COP program. The highest scored items related to COP's influence on its participants, the pupils they come in contact with, and the classrooms they work in. These items were rated above those which related to COP's influence on the classroom teacher. However, as previously noted, all items were given a score that indicated they should exist to a large extent.

All scores in the "actually exists" column were lower than those in the "should exist" column. This represents the difference between the ideal and the real and is somewhat predictable. The "actual existence" rank order of items almost mirrored the "should exist" ranking. Again, the training of these special personnel and their positive effect on pupils were ranked higher than improved classroom operation and influence on teachers.

Among the various sub-groups there was general agreement on the ideal aspect of all the attributes. Cooperating teachers and school principals basically scored all items lower than

did COP participants and graduates. Items 4, 6 and 7 stated that COP participants are able to relate theory to actual situations, teachers have more time for planning and teachers relate better to the neighborhood. These three items were found to be the ones most clearly separating the two combined groups described above.

As for the actual existence of these attributes in the Hartford COP project, again, cooperating teachers and school principals gave lower scores than did COP participants and graduates. The former groups showed their most agreement with the latter on those items dealing with the training of talented people who would otherwise not be trained (#9) and their influence on the pupils (#1 and #10). Note that all groups scored all items as existing to at least a moderate extent.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART F:

Please circle the degree of acceptability of each provision below.

None	Little Degree	Moderate Degree	Great Degree	Very Great Degree
1	2	3	4	5

Item #*		Mean Score**
2. Acceptability of COP participants as aides;	a. to faculty	4.2
	b. to administration	4.3
	c. to parents	4.3
	d. to pupils	4.5
4. Acceptability of COP graduates as teachers;	a. to faculty	4.2
	b. to administration	4.3
	c. to parents	4.4
	d. to pupils	4.4
1. Acceptability of teacher aides generally;	a. to faculty	4.0
	b. to administration	4.2
	c. to parents	4.3
	d. to pupils	4.4
5. Acceptability of career lattice concept;	a. to faculty	3.9
	b. to administration	4.1
	c. to parents	4.1
	d. to pupils	4.1
3. Acceptability of COP participants as assistant teachers;	a. to faculty	3.7
	b. to administration	3.9
	c. to parents	4.1
	d. to pupils	4.3

*Items have been arranged to show their mean score ranking.

**Part F of Appendix A shows mean scores by sub-group.

Discussion of Questionnaire: Part F

Part F was completed by all groups previously described, except university faculty. This section attempts to ascertain the acceptability of COP personnel and ideas.

For each provision, COP and/or its participants seemed to be most acceptable to pupils, followed by parents, then administration and lastly faculty. The acceptability of COP participants as aides and COP graduates as teachers had the highest scores. The acceptability of COP participants as assistant teachers received the lowest mean scores. However, almost all items received mean scores indicating a great to very great degree of acceptability.

COP graduates saw greater acceptability of these provisions, than any other group. Otherwise, differences among the groups were relatively minor. The one exception to the above was the school principals view of provision 3a, (the acceptability of COP participants as assistant teachers, to faculty); this was the only provision rated as moderate.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART G:

A significant expectation for each COP program is the presence of a career lattice relating incremental levels of training, responsibility and salary. Indicate the presence in your project of the following characteristics of career lattices.

Item #*	Item	Percent Indicating Item Presence**
9.	Health insurance and other fringe benefits included	98%
7.	Salaries scaled to be commensurate with training levels	90%
5.	Increased classroom responsibilities keyed to successive levels of training	90%
6.	Duties at all levels are appropriate to teacher trainees	83%
2.	Career lattice developed under COP project	69%
10.	Non-COP trainees are eligible for career lattice	62%
11.	Opportunities for continuing work status at levels below teacher for trainees not continuing in COP	62%
1.	Career lattice in place prior to beginning of COP project	57%
12.	The public schools are committed to continuing career lattice after COP is completed	57%
3.	Career lattice significantly modified as a result of COP project	53%
4.	Position titles through several levels of training to teacher	53%
8.	Salaries scaled to position titles	53%

*Items have been arranged to reflect their ranking.
**Percent of those responding to this section, N=58

Discussion of Questionnaire: Part G

Part G was to be completed by all groups except university faculty. However, a fairly small percentage (45%) of those eligible, actually responded to this section. As is indicated, the reported percentages for each item were calculated on the basis of those who responded in any way to this part of the questionnaire.

Part G asked respondents to indicate the presence in Hartford COP, of a number of characteristics of career lattices. Those items most often indicated reflect the contractual elements of the COP and paraprofessional program in Hartford (salaries and fringe benefits). In addition, the items relating to the hierarchy of duties and responsibilities were also considered as in evidence. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that the career lattice was developed under the COP project and this was confirmed by the COP Director. Responses to the other questions about the career lattice, its scope and its continuance were favorably reported by 53% to 62% of those responding.

Some of the confusion, in response to this section, most likely relates to the fact that all Hartford's paraprofessionals work under a negotiated contract, which includes many career ladder concepts. Therefore, these provisions may not have been considered unique to the COP project.

A very small number of cooperating teachers and school principals completed Part G. The sample of 58 is therefore most representative of COP participants and graduates.

D. Attitude Survey

The second piece of information gathered from respondents was their opinions on 52 items relating to COP. This attitude survey was completed by all sub-groups previously described, yielding an N of 144. The actual N for the individual items ranged from 119 to 140. Percentages have been calculated on the basis of each item's respective sample size. Responses are displayed in percentages for the five opinion choices on each item.

The survey items have been grouped into three categories: inputs, process and products. Similar items in each of these categories are arranged together for comparison. Original item numbers have been retained.

A discussion follows each of the three categories of items. In the discussions, the data are summarized, and inter-item and/or sub-group differences are highlighted. Appendix B presents the sub-group responses to the fifty-two items.

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION ATTITUDE SURVEY

Please circle the response consistent with your view of the Hartford Career Opportunities Program.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Questionable or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SA	A	?	DA	SDA

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages SA	A	?	DA	SDA
20.	Community participation and involvement were effectively included in COP.	6	28	54	11	1
25.	The Public Schools provided adequate released time for COP participants to continue their academic studies.	7	36	30	19	8
1.	The Public Schools have supported COP with sufficient resources.	12	43	37	4	4
10.	The COP Director and Staff demonstrated effective leadership for the program.	30	36	31	3	0
41.	COP participants were on a comparable level with other students at the University.	11	40	32	15	2
33.	COP participants were able to demonstrate adequate teaching skills.	11	64	20	4	1
30.	Most of the participants assumed the responsibility for designing their own academic program within the University requirements.	4	21	40	27	8

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages SA	A	?	DA	SDA
16.	Cooperating teachers had more effect on modifying participants teaching than the courses taken by the participants.	14	22	42	19	3
13.	Cooperating teachers provided adequate models of teaching skills.	16	58	21	2	3
21.	Cooperative Teachers facilitated communication between participants and principals.	10	32	48	6	4
14.	The school principal facilitated the success of COP.	16	36	43	5	0
17.	The evaluation feedback from the principals to the participants was an effective component of the program.	10	24	59	5	2
18.	University faculty were interested in and helpful to COP participants,	15	41	34	6	4
15.	University faculty geared their instruction to the needs of the participants.	10	31	39	18	2
29.	Adequate guidance and counseling was available to participants through COP or University staff.	10	38	37	11	4
7.	Cooperating teachers and University supervisors provided constructive evaluation to participants.	7	45	33	10	5

Discussion of "Input" Items

The first sixteen items represented the inputs of various groups in the COP project.

Item 20 stated that community participation and involvement were effectively included in COP. The majority (54%) of respondents had no opinion as to this statement. However, of thoseresponding more agreed (34%) than disagreed (12%). Among the sub-groups, only COP participants had a majority (58%) in agreement with the item.

Items 25 and 1 were concerned with the inputs of the Public Schools. A plurality (43%) agreed that adequate release time was given COP participants, while an additional 27 percent disagreed with item 25. In greatest agreement with this item were school principals (73%). The most disagreement came from University faculty (44%) followed by COP graduates (39%) and COP participants (38%). The majority (55%) agreed that the Public Schools have supported COP with sufficient resources (item #1). Disagreement with this item was minimal, with 67 percent of school principals having no opinion.

Item 10 dealt with the effective leadership of the COP Director and Staff. A majority of 66 percent agreed that effective leadership had been demonstrated. Only cooperating teachers (71%) had no opinion. COP participants and COP graduates were 93 percent and 84 percent in agreement. No sub-group disagreed with the statement.

Items 41, 33 and 30 were related to the activities of COP participants. The majority (51%) of all respondents felt that COP participants were on a comparable level with other students at the university (item #41). However, the majority (55%) of University faculty disagreed with this statement and both cooperating teachers and school principals had no opinion. Agreement was strong from both COP participants (76%) and COP graduates (77%). Item 33 stated that COP participants were able to demonstrate adequate teaching skills. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents agreed with this item. No group disagreed with the item, while school principals had no opinion. Item 30 stated that most of the participants assumed the responsibility for designing their own academic program within University requirements. A plurality (40%) of respondents had no opinion on this item, with 25 percent agreeing and 35 percent disagreeing. School principals and cooperating teachers both had no opinion. COP participants (41%), COP graduates (50%) and university faculty (56%) all registered disagreement. However, an additional 42 percent of COP graduates and 38 percent of COP participants agreed with item 30.

Items 16, 31 and 21 dealt with the inputs of cooperating teachers. Pluralities with no opinion was the response to both items 16 and 21. When asked whether cooperating teachers had more effect on participants than academic courses,

31% of the COP participants agreed and 40% disagreed. 46 percent of COP graduates agreed and 31 percent disagreed. Item 21 credited cooperating teachers with facilitating communication between participants and principals. A plurality (48%) of all respondents had no opinion on this statement. Again, as in item 16, cooperating teachers, school principals and university faculty all registered no opinion. The only group registering a majority was COP graduates, 54 percent of whom agreed with the statement. Item 13 stated that cooperating teachers provided adequate models of teaching skills. Unlike the prior two items, 74 percent of respondents agreed with this item. All sub-groups had a majority in agreement except university faculty, with 50 percent having no opinion. No group had greater than 8 percent in disagreement.

Item 14 and 17 were concerned with school principal's role in the COP project. Item 14 was a general statement which credited school principals with facilitating the success of COP. Fifty-two percent of the respondents were in agreement with this statement. A majority of all groups agreed with the statement except university faculty, who registered no opinion (88%). Disagreement with this item was minimal. Item 17 stated that evaluation feedback from the principals to the participants was an effective component of the program.

Fifty-nine percent of respondents had no opinion on this statement. COP participants (41%) and COP graduates (46%) showed agreement with the item, while the other three groups had majorities with no opinion. An additional 30 percent of COP participants disagreed with this statement. Items 18 and 15 were related to the inputs of university faculty. Item 18 stated that university faculty were interested in and helpful to COP participants. Fifty-six percent of the sample agreed with the statement and only ten percent disagreed. Cooperating teachers and school principals had no opinion on this subject.

Item 15 credited university faculty with gearing their instruction to the needs of the participants. A plurality (41%) agreed with this, and another 20 percent disagreed. Again, cooperating teachers and school principals had no opinion. COP participants had 41 percent in agreement and 30 percent disagreeing, while COP graduates had the opposite, 30 percent agreeing and 46 percent in disagreement. University faculty had 82 percent in agreement with this item.

Item 29 found a 48 percent plurality agreeing that adequate guidance and counseling was available to participants, through COP or university staff. The majorities of COP participants (70%), COP graduates (67%) and university faculty (60%) were in agreement with this item. However, cooperating teachers (74%) and school principals (78%) registered no opinion on the item. Disagreement ranged from 11 percent to 25 percent of the sub-group responses.

Item 7 had a majority of 52 percent in agreement that cooperating teachers and university supervisors provided constructive evaluation to participants. As in item 29, cooperating teachers and school principals had no opinion on the item, in contrast to COP participants, graduates and university faculty who all agreed with the statement. Disagreement with item 7 ranged from 11 percent to 20 percent of the sub-group responses.

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages SA	A	?	DA	SDA
PROCESS						
2.	COP was a well organized program.	24	40	26	8	2
3.	All participating groups were given the opportunity to participate in the identification of general and specific goals and priorities of COP.	16	34	40	5	5
4.	The screening and selection of participants was in keeping with COP goals.	12	39	39	7	3
44.	Participants did not have an adequate voice in the administration and functioning of COP.	6	17	58	17	2
8.	There was effective communication between participants and COP staff.	19	42	24	11	4
9.	If a participant had a problem, he/she knew the proper channels to go through.	20	36	31	11	2
5.	The idea and existence of a career lattice was never clearly understood by all participating groups.	8	25	39	23	5
35.	The career lattice was a motivating force for participants.	10	51	30	7	2
23.	COP was able to structure the academic program for the participants so that maximum transfer took place in the classroom.	6	31	49	9	5
12.	Course experiences on the whole were not related to classroom experiences.	5	19	26	41	9
50.	Teaching competencies can be better learned in the public schools, than in the college classroom.	17	39	21	12	11

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages SA	A	?	DA	SDA
26.	COP participants should be grouped together for their courses and separated from other students at the University.	5	6	17	26	46
22.	The University standards set for COP participants were not as high as those for students in the regular teacher-training program.	5	15	34	24	22
28.	COP participants were unable to participate in campus activities at the University.	3	23	51	14	9
31.	Participants were guided to develop their own unique styles of teaching after minimal competencies were accomplished.	8	29	49	10	4
27.	COP participants should be trained in a limited number of selected schools.	6	13	16	37	28
6.	All participating groups were asked to evaluate the various phases, activities, and programs of COP.	3	29	44	15	9
36.	Insufficient feedback was available regarding the performance of participants, children, and staff.	5	25	45	22	3
24.	The evaluation process in the program led to effective learning on the part of the participant.	14	45	40	1	0
11.	COP was a severe drain on the participants time and energy.	7	15	27	34	17
19.	COP was not flexible to the individual needs of its participants.	5	12	37	34	12

Discussion of "Process" Items

The next 21 items were associated with the procedural operations of the Hartford COP project.

Items 2, 3, 4, and 44 dealt with the organization and administration of the COP program. Sixty-four percent of the sample regarded COP as a well organized program (item 2). No group disagreed with this item; however, 56 percent of the cooperating teachers had no opinion. Item 3, which stated that all participating groups were given the opportunity to participate in the identification of general and specific goals and priorities of COP, had 50 percent of respondents agreeing and only ten percent disagreeing. COP participants (68%), COP graduates (70%) and university faculty (50%), all agreed with the item, and cooperating teachers (71%) and school principals (54%) gave no opinion. Item 4 stated that the screening and selection of participants was in keeping with COP goals. Fifty-one percent (51%) of the sample were in agreement with this item. Disagreement with the statement by sub-groups was minimal, and ranged from three percent to ten percent. In general, sub-groups responses to item 4 were very similar to those scored in item 3 above. Item 44 had a 58 percent majority with no opinion as to whether participants had an adequate voice in the administration and functioning of COP. A plurality (37%) of COP participants agreed with the statement, while 40 percent of COP graduates disagreed.

Items 8, and 9 were concerned with the process of communication. Sixty-one percent of all respondents felt that there was effective communication between participants and COP staff. Fifty-six percent agreed that if a participant had a problem he/she knew the proper channels to go through. Sub-group responses to both items was almost identical. COP participants, graduates and university faculty had clear majorities agreeing with the item, and yet, cooperating teachers and school principals registered no opinion.

Items 5 and 35 questioned respondents about the career lattice. Item 35 stated that the career lattice was a motivating force for participants. Sixty-one percent of the sample agreed with this item. In general, all groups were in agreement on this item. Item 5 stated that the idea and existence of a career lattice was never clearly understood by all participating groups. Only 33 percent of the respondents agreed with this item, another 28 percent disagreed, and the plurality (39%) had no opinion. Sub-group opinions were all somewhat similar to this distribution.

Items 23, 12, and 50 related the academic training of COP participants to their daily work experience. Only 37% of the respondents agreed that COP was able to structure the academic program for the participants so that maximum transfer took place in the classroom (item 23). Forty percent (40%) of COP participants agreed with this statement, as did 56% of the university faculty.

Thirty-nine percent of COP graduates also agreed with it, but an additional 46 percent were found to disagree. Cooperating teachers and school principals gave no opinion. Item 12, which stated that course experiences on the whole were not related to classroom experience, found 50 percent of the sample disagreeing with it. Majorities of COP participants, graduates and university faculty disagreed, while cooperating teachers and school principals had no opinion. Agreement with this item ranged from zero percent (school principals) to 38 percent (COP graduates), among the sub-group reponses. Fifty-six percent of the respondents agreed that teaching competencies can be better learned in the public schools, than in the college classroom. A majority of each group agreed with this statement, except university faculty, who gave no opinion.

Items 26, 22, 28, 31 and 27 related to procedures that directly affected COP participants. A clear majority (72%) of the sample, and all sub-groups, disagreed with the statement that COP participants should be grouped together for their courses and separated from other students at the university (item 26). Note that the Hartford COP project did not isolate its participants for their academic experience. A plurality (46%) of respondents also disagreed with the statement that the university standard set for COP participants were not as high as those for students in the regular

teacher-training program (item 22). Strongest disagreement came from COP participants, graduates and university faculty. Cooperating teachers and school principals gave no opinion. Agreement with this item ranged from 14 percent (COP participants) to 30 percent (university faculty). Item 28, which stated that COP participants were unable to participate in university campus activities, had 51 percent of the sample giving no opinion. COP participants disagreed (43%) with the item, but COP graduates agreed (59%) with it. In addition, 34 percent of COP participants agreed with the statement and 33 percent of COP graduates disagreed with it. A plurality (49%) of all respondents registered no opinion as to whether participants were guided to develop their own unique style of teaching after minimal competencies were accomplished (item 31). On the other hand, 45 percent of COP participants and 58 percent of COP graduates agreed with the statement. Greatest disagreement also came from COP participants (31%) and graduates (34%). Sixty-five percent of the respondents disagreed with the idea that COP participants should be trained in a limited number of selected schools (item 27). Note, Hartford COP spread its participants throughout the Hartford Public School System. All groups disagreed with this item, except university faculty who registered 50 percent agreeing and 50 percent disagreeing. Other agreement with item 27 came from cooperating teachers (33%).

Items 6, 36, and 24 questioned the evaluative processes of the project. Items6 and 36 had pluralities with no opinion. Thirty-two percent (32%) of the sample agreed and 24 percent disagreed with the statement that all participating groups were asked to evaluate the various phases, activities and programs of COP (item 6). Within each sub-group, there was almost an equal distribution of agreement, no opinion, disagreement. Likewise, 45 percent of all respondents had no-opinion as to whether insufficient feedback was available regarding the performance of participants, children and staff (item 36). Only COP graduates (50%) and school principals (50%) had majorities which agreed with the statement. Disagreement with item 36 ranged from 11 percent (school principals) to 33 percent (COP participants). In contrast to the two previous items, 50 percent of the respondents agreed that the evaluation process in the program led to effective learning on the part of the participant (item 24). There was very little disagreement with this statement, however, cooperating teachers, school principals, and university faculty all gave no opinion.

Fifty-one percent of the sample disagreed with item 11, which stated that COP was a severe drain on the participants' time and energy. Twenty-two percent of all respondents agreed with the statement, including 40 percent of the university faculty.

Item 19 asked respondents whether COP was flexible to the needs of its participants. Forty-six percent found COP to be flexible while 17 percent considered it inflexible. Cooperating teachers and school principals gave no opinion on this item. Among the sub-groups, agreement with the statement ranged from 10 percent (school principals) to 23 percent (COP graduates). COP participants, graduates, and university faculty all had at least 60 percent disagreeing with item 19, or supporting COP's flexibility.

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages SA	A	?	DA	SDA
PRODUCTS						
46.	COP has improved the self-understanding, self-image, and self-confidence of the participants.	45	45	8	2	0
40.	COP participants were able to function more effectively as teacher aides than were non-COP para-professionals.	23	32	28	14	3
32.	COP participants were better prepared for teaching than students going through traditional teacher-training programs.	14	34	28	17	7
38.	Graduates of COP will be more successful than graduates from other teacher education programs.	15	16	44	18	7
37.	COP was a positive learning experience on the part of all involved.	32	46	17	3	2
42.	COP has aided a number of other special programs in the Public Schools.	6	28	62	4	0
43.	COP has increased cooperation between the University and the Public Schools.	12	49	34	3	2
47.	COP has increased the school community relationship.	22	50	24	3	1

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages SA	A	?	DA	SDA
39.	The community no longer has a need for a program such as COP.	1	1	17	32	49
45.	The Public Schools should make every effort to continue COP in some way.	46	37	14	3	0
34.	The present limited number of teacher openings is a valid reason for ending COP.	3	9	20	34	34
48.	The cost of COP is the major factor which might prohibit its continuance.	17	26	40	13	4
49.	The benefits of COP have not justified the dollars spent.	2	8	22	36	32
51.	COP has substantially achieved its goals and objectives.	12	47	38	3	0
52.	COP has improved education in the Public Schools.	22	48	25	4	1

Discussion of "Product" Items

The fifteen remaining items all related to outcomes of the COP project.

Items 46, 40, 32, 38, and 37 dealt with the effects of COP on its participants. Ninety percent of all respondents agreed with item 46, that COP has improved the self-understanding, self-image, and self-confidence of the participants. All sub-group scores reflected this strong opinion. Fifty-five percent of the sample agreed with the statement that COP participants were able to function more effectively as teacher aides than were non-COP paraprofessionals (item 40). School principals (45%) disagreed with this item and university faculty gave no opinion. On both item 32 and 38 the sample split into two distinct camps. The majority of COP participants and graduates agreed with both statements, which basically affirmed that COP participants and graduates are better prepared and will be more successful than other students. On the other hand, cooperative teachers, school principals and university faculty either registered disagreement or no opinion on these items. Item 37 stated that COP was a positive learning experience on the part of all involved. Seventy-eight percent of the total sample were in agreement with this. Disagreement with this item was minimal.

Items 42, 43 and 47 presented some of the other less direct outcomes of the project. Item 42, COP has aided a number of other programs in the Public Schools, received a majority (62%) of no opinion responses. Although there was very little disagreement with this item, only COP participants (43%) and COP graduates (39%) had substantial numbers of respondents in agreement with it. The majority (61%) of respondents indicated that COP had increased cooperation between the University and the Public Schools (item 43). Cooperating teachers and school principals, though not disagreeing, had no opinion. Item 47 stated that COP has increased the school-community relationship. Seventy-two percent of the sample agreed with this statement. As in the previous item, COP participants, graduates and university faculty were in strong agreement with the item, while cooperating teachers and school principals were considerably weaker in their agreement.

Items 39, 45, 34 and 48 were concerned with future aspects of COP. Eighty-one percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement that the community no longer has a need for a program such as COP (item 39). Another clear majority (83%) agreed with item 45, the Public Schools should make every effort to continue COP in some way. In both of these items,

total scores also represented all sub-group opinions. Items 34 and 48 questioned the reason for ending COP. The majority (68%) of the sample disagreed with the statement that the present limited number of teacher openings is a valid reason for ending COP (item 34). All sub-groups also disagreed with this item. Item 48 stated that the cost of COP is the major factor which might prohibit its continuance. The plurality (43%) of respondents agreed with this item, while 40 percent gave no opinion. No sub-groups disagreed with the statement but only COP participants (50%) and graduates (85%) were in definite agreement with it.

Items 49, 51, and 52 were global statements as to Hartford COP's effectiveness. Sixty-eight percent of all respondents disagreed with the statement that the benefits of COP have not justified the dollars spent (item 49). No group agreed with this item and only school principals registered no opinion. The majority (59%) of the sample agreed that COP has substantially achieved its goals and objectives (item 51). Although disagreement with this item was minimal, cooperating teachers (69%), school principals (88%), and university faculty (56%) all gave no opinion. Item 52 stated that COP has improved education in the Public Schools. A clear majority of 70% of the total sample agreed with this statement. All sub-groups had their majorities agreeing with the exception of school principals who had 50 percent with no opinion. Both of the last two items had very strong, positive responses from COP participants and COP graduates.

V

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Structured interviews, with COP administrative personnel, were conducted to gain insights that may not have been available from the instrument responses. Those interviewed included the COP Director, IHE Coordinator, IHE-School of Education Dean and Assistant Dean, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent of the Hartford Public Schools and Director of Research and Evaluation for the Hartford Public Schools.

These individuals were asked to respond to a series of questions which follows. Responses given are listed under each question. Any one response may have been mentioned by more than one person and the order of responses listed has no significance.

PART A.

1. Was COP supported, at its inception, by the community and the Local Educational Agency (LEA)?

-The community, the University of Hartford (IHE) and the Hartford Board all cooperated in establishing the project and choosing the Director.

-The community in general and the LEA were very supportive of COP at its beginning.

-The involvement of community people in some of the planning stages has really paid off.

-The Hartford Board wanted this project to succeed. They knew it could help the school community relationship and help educate kids.

2. How and why were COP participants chosen?

-we tried to pick people according to the National COP guidelines.

-we took some real risks, which was the spirit of COP.

-community people and paraprofessionals have always been in on the selection of COP participants.

-they had to be Hartford paraprofessionals prior to being selected.

-the IHE had a limited input in the choice of participants.

-the IHE was flexible in admitting all participants it was sent by COP.

-the Advisory Council developed the criteria for selection and retention of participants.

-the participants were good choices considering the fact that we don't expect all of them to graduate with a B.S. degree.

-participants were supposed to be residents of Hartford, some were not.

-the choice of participants could have been a more cooperative effort between the LEA and the IHE.

3. What was the role of community organization in COP?

-they had memberships on the Advisory Council.

-the early participation of the Model Cities Agency has faded away.

-we've had a joint effort with the Community Renewal Team (CRT) in running the Youth Tutoring Youth program.

-Model Cities did not give the support it could have.

-our relationships have been good.

4. What have been some of the major strengths and weaknesses (or constraints) of the program?

STRENGTHS

-The Director's freedom from the LEA and the IHE was very important.

-the availability of COP staff to the participants

-the individualized instruction and assistance given participants

-the flexibility of the IHE

-the mainstreaming of COP participants in IHE courses

-the COP Director

-the University faculty began to teach rather than lecture

-the IHE-School of Education gained knowledge about urban education from this experience

-there's been very little fat in this program, all dollars have gone back to the people and very little money was spent on administering the program

-our people were high risks, it was a second chance for them and they succeeded

-the IHE Coordinator had freedom in his role of assisting the participants

-we spread our people (participants) out among all Hartford schools

WEAKNESSES AND CONSTRAINTS

-I wish we could have opened the program to all para-professionals

-we really needed a full-time IHE Coordinator in the early years of the program

-COP participants needed and deserved release time from their classroom duties

-there were some problems between COP and the IHE Admissions office

-the IHE Coordinator has too many roles (academic advisor, counselor and teacher)

-there was a need for a closer liason between the COP Director and the IHE.

-we could have gotten more city input

-the role of the Advisory Council needed to be better defined

-more community organizations should have been involved

-we needed more alternatives in terms of careers for the participants

-maybe we could have used a community college for the first two years of training

-a consortium of colleges may have been preferable

-the career lattice never quite made it, we had a career ladder

-mandatory student teaching was a problem

-communications among the IHE, CEA and COP Director somewhat deteriorated over time

5. What evaluation of the project was conducted?

-the only formal evaluation was the Abt. Associates, and that was interviews only.

-the Director conducted informal evaluations and reported the same in the annual reports

-the Advisory Council was always in touch with COP's problem

-the IHE did some in-house self evaluation, to improve the operation of COP

-there have been dollar constraints in terms of conducting an adequate evaluation

-national COP evaluations caused alot of data gathering and confusion while providing very little feedback on the Hartford COP operation

-we neglected designing a good evaluation plan, five years ago

6. Has the financial support of the LEA been adequate?

-they've done what they could

-they gave a number of services in kind, if not the dollars

-it could have provided some release time for participants

-it should consider continuing the program at its expense. it's worth it

-COP has been linked with some other federal programs (i.e. Title I)

-they've given the paraprofessionals a pretty good contract

7. Has the SEA (Connecticut State Department of Education) been of assistance to the COP project?

-there has been some limited technical assistance

-they have regularly attended the Advisory Council meetings

-their role has been limited and never clearly defined

-they've had a minimal input

8. Has the U.S. Office of Education been of assistance to the COP project?

-they've been excellent, they established good communication with all parties

-assistance has been fine but we could have gotten more publicity

-they helped solve a number of problems

-the decentralization of COP administration to the Boston Regional Office was a great advantage

-couldn't have done it without their help

9. What has been the role of the Advisory Council?

-to make decisions on questions provided by the Director

-to select participants and make policy

-it has been a great experience for those community members who served on it.

-it decreased in activity over the life of the project

-it represented the community

-its role was to challenge the Director

-to keep the project on track with its goals and objectives

-a means of communication for all groups and organizations involved

10. What has been the relationship between the IHE and the LEA?

-there has been a very open relationship between the LEA and the Dean's office

-we began well but communication has somewhat deteriorated over the last two years

-the IHE has made many adjustments on the basis of LEA recommendations

-we have had a good relationship

-the University is involved in many programs with the LEA

-the University has lived up to its obligation to the LEA and the COP participants

-we've worked closely on many problems and have used each other as resources

-all things considered, this joint effort has been very successful and productive

-the University is definitely a part of the city

11. What happens to COP participants who have not graduated by August of 1975?

-many of them won't to be able to finish their B.S. degree, due to financial constraints

-they are eligible for Hartford Board of Education reimbursement for a percentage of their educational expenses

-some provision should be made to guarantee the remaining enrollees a break

-a large percentage of those left will not make it, they must have summer stipends and all expenses covered

-both the Hartford Board and the University have an obligation to these individuals

-some negotiated agreement between the IHE and LEA will be worked out; this will give the remaining participants a chance to finish their studies

-it wasn't the idea of COP to give all participants an undergraduate degree

-some of these paraprofessionals/participants will be satisfied with an associate degree

-the LEA is in a tight financial situation and may not have any funds available to assist these individuals

-the University has made an offer to the Hartford Board which provides for reduced tuition charges for COP participants

-some participants may take advantage of the reduced charge program at the University

-a good number of the participants are close to graduating and may somehow scrape the dollars together

12. What is the future of COP type programs?

-there will be increased in-service activities

-there will be increased use of on the job training credits by IHE's

-COP as an idea for teacher education is not dead

-COP type training should be expanded to other occupations

-COP yields good teachers and we'll always need good teachers

-more government aid should be requested and granted, based on COP's success

-teacher training institutions should and will pick up on this scheme

-dollars are the main problem for programs of this type

-more cooperative work-study programs will be implemented

-Hartford is using some COP ideas in other training programs

-the over-supply of teachers is a problem for the continuation of COP

13. What has been the acceptability of COP and COP people to the community and to the educational community?

-they've been hired and that was our goal

-acceptance has been excellent in both the community and in the schools

-COP people have come to be respected at the IHE

-acceptability took time but it is now established

-COP people are respected in the community

-COP people have gained the admiration of principals and teachers

-students depend on COP participants and paraprofessionals in general

-COP graduates will be first in line for new and open teaching positions

14. Has Hartford COP accomplished its goals?

-yes, we've produced teachers who can relate

-it helped poor people find a meaningful career

-our teachers now have educated paraprofessionals who are community people

-COP has been responsible for improving our school volunteer program

-COP participants and graduates have greatly helped the entire school system

-COP has satisfactorily accomplished its goals

-we got community people into the schools

-we couldn't have done much better than we did

-Hartford COP has played by the rules and has achieved its goals

Part B of the structured interview was conducted with the IHE personnel only. These questions were part of the Northeast Education Associates evaluation design. The instructions read:

Cooperating institutions of higher education have adjusted their programs in a number of ways in order to facilitate the admission and training of participants.

What types of adjustments were made at your institution?

(Questions and responses follow.)

1. In admission requirements?

   -we had to radically adjust our admissions standards and procedures

   -only the high school diploma, or its equivalent for those who earned their degrees at night school, was required

2. In granting credit for work experience?

   -credit was given for on the job training (OJT), as a part of the undergraduate program

3. In granting credit for previous course work?

   -transfer credit was given for community college coursework as long as it was a grade of C minus or above

   -credit for previous work done at other institutions of higher learning was generously given

4. In program requirements?

   -we bent some rules here; there was a rock bottom number of Liberal Arts requirements

   -they pushed us into accepting the on the job training as a part of the program

   -the University developed an Associate of Arts in Education degree for our COP program; this is a commendable two year program in education

5. In course content?

-COP participants were in classes with regular University students, so course content was not affected

-in some cases COP participants added to the course content by relating their experiences to other students

6. In scheduling?

-we scheduled around the COP people

-both evenings and summer courses were scheduled with COP in mind

-the University has bent over backwards to schedule courses in the evening and during the summer to enable our people to complete their Associate or B.S. degree requirements

7. In degree requirements?

-the number of credits for the B.S. degree was unaffected as was the quality standards of acceptable work

8. Others?

-in the area of finances, the University has billed the COP program at one-half the regular tuition charges for our on the job courses and workshops

9. Which of the above adjustments were applicable to COP participants only? and which will continue in effect?

-almost all of these adjustments were made for COP only

-these adjustments have had a good affect on the University

-the flexibility of making adjustments similar to these as part of the University's operation

10. What special institutional problems had to be overcome in order to accomplish these adjustments?

-a good deal of cooperation and coordination with the College of Arts and Sciences was required

-each adjustment had to be approved by the University officials involved and the administration; they were basically very flexible

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data gathered and analyses performed, this evaluation concludes that the Hartford Career Opportunities Program has substantially achieved its goals. More specific evaluative statements, that relate to various aspects of the program, are provided below.

1.0 The selection of COP participants was in the spirit of national COP.

1.1 Participants were community members.

1.2 Participants were representative of the Black majority population in Hartford.

1.3 Hartford COP was unable to enlist and maintain a substantial number of males or Spanish-speaking participants.

This shortcoming is amplified by the desire for more male role models in elementary schools and the last five year increase in Hartford's Spanish-speaking population.

1.4 Those participants with the greatest education prior to COP, also clearly achieved the most during the program.

2.0 The Hartford Board of Education supported COP with adequate financial and other resources.

2.1 The Hartford Board of Education delegated a good deal of authority in the running of COP, to the Advisory Council and the Director.

2.2 There was some lack of continuity of those persons in the central office administration that were directly involved with the program.

3.0 University faculty and administration were interested in and helpful to COP participants.

3.1 In many cases, university faculty were flexible enough to accomodate the special needs of COP participants.

3.2 A number of university faculty were uninformed about the COP project in general and what the participants were doing in the Hartford Schools.

3.3 Prior to the hiring of a full-time COP College Coordinator academic advice and counsel for participants was inadequate.

4.0 Cooperating teachers and school principals supported COP and facilitated its success.

4.1 Cooperating teachers provided adequate models of teaching skills.

4.2 Both groups did not have clearly defined roles in the project.

4.3 Both groups were somewhat unaware of COP in general and the activities of COP participants at the University.

5.0 The COP Director and Advisory Council provided effective leadership for the program.

5.1 The COP Director played a strong leadership role in pursuing the goals of the project.

5.2 The advisory Council performed its assigned duties.

There was a need for greater continuity of membership and better attendance at council meetings.

6.0 The Hartford Community was represented and involved in the establishment and operation of the project.

6.1 Individual community members had a critical role in the program, through their membership on the Advisory Council.

6.2 More community organizations could have been actively involved in the program.

6.3 Those community organizations involved in the beginning of the program showed decreasing interest and involvement as the project progressed.

7.0 COP was effectively organized and administered.

7.1 Spreading COP participants throughout all Hartford Schools was a success.

7.2 Placing COP participants in regular university classes was also a success.

7.3 No released time for participants to attend university classes was a problem for participants and may have contributed to a number of enrollees not finishing their undergraduate program.

7.4 There was a constant over-demand by Hartford paraprofessionals for the limited number of COP slots.

7.5 Cooperating teachers were not screened for their ability to effectively work with COP participants. Cooperative teachers should have received some in-service training and linkage with the university.

7.6 School principals, university faculty and cooperating teachers were not involved in the decision making process.

8.0 Evaluation of the project was unplanned and inadequate.

8.1 Self-evaluation by the various groups involved in the project caused some improvements to be made during the program.

8.2 A regular and formal evaluation plan, including some performance objectives, was not instituted at the proposal stage.

8.3 This failure to plan for evaluations prevents more conclusive and supported statements on the programs impact (especially on students).

9.0 The University training provided the participants has made them better educators.

9.1 Refresher courses, provided at the beginning of the program, helped a number of participants.

9.2 Special and summer courses offered by various faculty and departments were extremely beneficial.

9.3 The program was never formally evaluated for its content and the participants experiences in various courses.

9.4 The program was flexible by providing credit for on-the-job training.

10.0 The Career Lattice, described in the 1969 project proposal was never really established.

10.1 COP participants did not have a choice of programs.

10.2 The career ladder (vertical movement only) that did develop was well understood by participants and served as a motivating force.

11.0 Although communication in COP was basically open and adequate, some problems did exist.

11.1 Cooperating teachers, school principals, and university faculty were either not informed or not interested in various aspects of the program.

11.2 There was effective communication between participants and the COP staff.

11.3 There was effective communication between the Hartford Board of Education and the University of Hartford.

12.0 COP has had a distinct impact on people and institutions in Hartford.

12.1 COP's greatest success has been the increased self-understanding, self-image, and self-confidence of the participants.

12.11 COP has been a means of upward mobility for its participants.

12.2 COP participants have had a far reaching impact on Hartford's youth.

12.21 Participants served as role models for students.

12.22 Students were able to identify with and relate to the participants.

12.23 Participants' greatest impact on students has been in affective areas, such as self-image, educational aspirations, socialization, and attitude toward school.

12.24 Participants were able to provide more and better individualized help to pupils.

12.3 COP has increased the school community relationship.

12.31 COP directly involved community members in the decision making process (Advisory Council)

12.32 COP put more community people in Hartford classrooms.

12.4 COP has influenced the University as an institution as well as individual faculty members.

12.41 COP caused a number of adjustments to the regular university program, many of which proved worthwhile.

12.42 COP improved the Hartford Public Schools/ University of Hartford relationship and has resulted in other cooperative ventures.

12.43 Faculty and other university students profitted by having COP participants in their classes.

12.44 A better understanding of the nature and needs of urban education as well as the benefits of work-study, were university gains from involvement with COP.

12.5 COP has had an impact on classroom operation and classroom teachers.

12.51 COP participants served as a valuable resource in the classroom.

12.52 COP participants assisted teachers in working with students, parents and the community.

12.53 COP put better educated paraprofessionals into the classroom.

12.54 COP has helped establish the importance of paraprofessionals and has resulted in an improved status for all paraprofessionals.

12.6 The COP philosophy as well as its participants have been accepted and have become respected in the community and its educational system.

12.61 COP graduates have been hired to teach in Hartford.

12.62 Future COP graduates have been prorised a first crack at teacher openings.

12.63 In the last five years the number of paraprofessionals in Hartford schools has doubled and in the present fiscal crunch no paraprofessionals have been laid off.

13.0 The cooperative effort of the Hartford Board of Education, the University of Hartford, and the Hartford community, has proven that these groups can work together and produce.

14.0 The amount of education received by COP participants and the number of COP graduates now teaching in Hartford have justified the federal, state and local funds expended on this program.

15.0 COP has been a positive learning experience on the part of all those involved.

16.0 Hartford COP has substantially achieved its program goals.

17.0 COP has improved education in the Hartford Public Schools

18.0 The Hartford community and its school system still have a need for a program similar to COP.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hartford Board of Education should make every effort to continue or renew the COP goals and approach.

The University of Hartford should consider institutionalizing some of the aspects of the COP teacher training.

Both the Hartford Board of Education and the University of Hartford have an obligation to those participants who have not completed their program of study.

> Note that not all participants were expected to complete a four year degree. However, a negotiated agreement with reduced fees (University of Hartford) and possible subsidies (Hartford Board of Education) would assist those participants now close to graduation.

APPENDIX A

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX A: HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A:

Certain characteristics have been identified as evidencing successful COP programs. Please circle the relative weight as determiners of success which should be given to the statements below. Add others which you feel to be appropriate measures of success. Also, circle the E for those which were evident in your project.

No Weight	Little Weight	Moderate Weight	Great Weight	Very Great Weight
1	2	3	4	5

	Mean Scores by Sub-Group					
	CP*	CG	CT	SP	UF	TP
1. COP participants show strong motivation to continue in the program and become teachers.	4.6	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.3
2. COP participants have a positive professional view of themselves.	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.6	4.2
3. COP participants are representative of the minority population.	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0
4. COP program has provided a vehicle for the upward mobility of aides.	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.1	4.6	4.5
5. COP program has caused changes in the ways schools have utilized personnel.	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.0	3.9	3.5
6. COP program has caused existing personnel to be trained for new roles.	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6
7. COP program has resulted in changes in other preparation programs within the University.	3.0	3.2	3.2	2.8	3.9	3.2
8. COP program has resulted in gains for low-income and minority students in their learning, behavior, attitudes and aspirations.	4.4	4.0	4.0	3.4	4.7	4.1
9. COP program has caused changes in the organization and structure of the Public Schools.	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.4	3.1	3.3

CP=COP participant (presently enrolled) CG=COP graduate
CT=Cooperating teacher SP=School principal
UF=University faculty TP=Total population

APPENDIX A: HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART B:

Please circle the importance to you, of the COP goals listed below. Also, indicate your perception of the achievement of each goal in your project.

None Little Moderate Great Very Great

		Mean Scores by Sub-Group					
		CP	CP	CT	SP	UF	T
1. To provide education for indigenous low-income people who previously lacked the means, so as to enable them to advance to a level at which they feel comfortable, with the ultimate possibility of graduating as a professional teacher.							
	GOAL IMPORTANCE	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.6
	GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	4.5	4.5	3.8	3.5	3.4	4.1
2. To successfully establish a career lattice plan so as to provide both the experience and academic training necessary to enable people from low-income areas to enter the field of education.							
	GOAL IMPORTANCE	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.6
	GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	4.4	4.5	3.7	3.5	3.5	4.0
3. To improve school-community relations by involving members of the target community in making decisions about and in the operation of the program.							
	GOAL IMPORTANCE	4.1	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.1
	GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	4.2	3.9	3.2	3.3	2.9	3.6

CP=COP participant (presently enrolled) CG=COP graduate
CT=Cooperating teacher SP=School principal
UF=University faculty T=Total population

APPENDIX A

PART B: continued

	CP	CG	CT	SP	UF	T
4. To assist teachers, through the use of indigenous supportive personnel, in developing the ability to engage in an honest dialogue with urban youth, adults, and with other personnel working with city residents.						
GOAL IMPORTANCE	4.5	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.3	4.1
GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	4.3	4.2	3.5	2.6	3.0	3.7
5. To maintain and expand the present Youth Tutoring Youth Program which serves as the first step on the Career Lattice and will hopefully motivate youngsters into entering the field of education by providing early goals which are attainable and a partial source of income.						
GOAL IMPORTANCE	4.0	4.3	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.0
GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	3.7	3.4	3.0	2.3	2.6	3.2
6. To establish through the COP program a new source of teachers who, as a result of being indigenous to the area, will serve as models to the students and who will be better equipped (through familiarity with local problems) to meet existing needs.						
GOAL IMPORTANCE	4.6	4.8	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4
GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	4.4	4.4	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.8
7. To bring about change in the pre-service Teacher Preparation Programs.						
GOAL IMPORTANCE	4.1	4.7	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.1
GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	3.9	4.2	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.6

APPENDIX A: HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART C:

A goal of COP is to bring about change as a result of its activities. Please circle the extent of the COP program impact on the items below.

No Impact	Little Impact	Moderate Impact	Great Impact	Very Great Impact

		Mean Scores by Sub-Group					
		CP	CG	CT	SP	UF	T
1.	Pupils	4.3	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.8
2.	Teachers	4.0	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.7	3.6
3.	Administration	3.9	3.6	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.4
4.	Parents	4.2	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.6	3.7
5.	Participants	4.6	4.5	3.8	4.0	4.5	4.2
6.	Community	4.2	3.8	3.3	3.2	3.6	3.7
7.	University	4.1	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.8
8.	Teacher Certification	4.0	3.9	2.9	2.7	3.2	3.5
9.	Admissions Standards	3.7	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.4
10.	Public Schools	4.1	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.7
11.	Classroom Organization	4.2	4.0	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.8
12.	Methods of Instruction	4.2	4.1	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.8
13.	In-service training	4.1	4.2	3.2	3.1	4.0	3.7
14.	Legislation	3.1	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.2	2.9

APPENDIX A: HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART D:

An anticipated product of COP is positive impact on pupils from interaction with COP participants. Please circle the degree to which the presence of a COP Trainee or COP trained teacher has had such a positive effect.

No Effect	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	Great Effect	Very Great Effect
1	2	3	4	5

MEAN SCORES BY SUB-GROUP

	COP TRAINEE					COP TRAINED TEACHER				
	CP*	CG	CT	SP	TP	CP	CG	CT	SP	TP
1. Improved performance on achievement tests.	3.8	4.1	2.5	2.9	3.3	4.2	3.8	2.9	3.3	3.7
2. Reduction in discipline problems.	4.0	4.0	2.8	3.7	3.6	4.4	4.2	3.1	4.1	4.0
3. Improved attitude toward school.	4.3	4.1	2.8	3.3	3.7	4.5	4.1	3.0	4.1	4.0
4. Improved self-image	4.5	4.4	3.0	3.7	3.9	4.7	4.3	3.4	4.6	4.3
5. Improved school attendance.	3.9	4.1	2.5	2.9	3.3	4.2	4.0	2.9	3.4	3.8
6. Improved school grades.	4.1	4.0	2.6	2.9	3.4	4.3	3.9	2.9	3.5	3.8
7. Improved socialization in classroom.	4.2	4.1	2.9	3.2	3.7	4.5	4.2	2.9	4.0	4.1
8. Improved educational aspirations.	4.3	4.3	2.9	3.1	3.7	4.7	4.3	3.2	4.0	4.2

*CP=COP participants CG=COP graduates CT=Cooperating teachers SP=School principals

TP=Total population

APPENDIX A: HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART E:

People have identified many different attributes of a COP program. Please circle your judgement as to whether the condition should exist as a result of the COP program and as to whether the condition actually exists in your project.

Not at All 1	To a Little Extent 2	To a Moderate Extent 3	To a Large Extent 4	To a Very Large Extent 5

	MEAN SCORES BY SUB-GROUP					
	CP*	CG	CT	SP	UF	TP
1. Pupils received more individualized help.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.6	-	4.1
2. Teachers are relieved of non-teaching jobs.						
SHOULD EXIST	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.1	3.5	3.2	3.3	-	3.6
3. Teachers are helped to provide a greater variety of activities.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.4	4.9	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.4
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.1	4.5	3.3	3.4	-	3.8
4. COP participants are able to relate theory to actual situations.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.3	4.7	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.1
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.1	-	3.8

*CP=COP participants
CG=COP graduates
CT=Cooperating teachers
SP=School principals
UF=University faculty
TP=Total population

PART E: continued

	MEAN SCORES BY SUB-GROUP					
	CP	CG	CT	SP	UF	TP
5. Teachers have more time for planning.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.1
ACTUALLY EXISTS	3.8	3.5	3.1	3.2	-	3.4
6. Teachers related better to the neighborhood.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.5	4.6	3.7	3.9	3.2	4.0
ACTUALLY EXISTS	3.9	3.5	2.9	3.1	-	3.4
7. Makes teaching more rewarding.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.5	4.7	3.6	3.9	4.2	4.1
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.3	4.4	3.2	3.2	-	3.7
8. Results in better use of time in classroom.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.5	4.9	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.4
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.3	4.4	3.5	3.1	-	3.8
9. Training of talented people who would otherwise not be trained.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.6	4.6	3.9	3.7	-	4.3
10. Provides the children with a person with whom they can identify.						
SHOULD EXIST	4.6	4.8	4.1	4.3	4.8	4.4
ACTUALLY EXISTS	4.6	4.3	3.5	3.8	-	4.1

APPENDIX A: HARTFORD COP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART F:

Please circle the degree of acceptability of each provision below.

None	Little Degree	Moderate Degree	Great Degree	Very Great Degree
1	2	3	4	5

		MEAN SCORES BY SUB-GROUP				
		CP*	CG	CT	SP	TP
1. Acceptability of teacher aides generally;	a. to faculty	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.0
	b. to administration	4.0	4.4	4.0	4.6	4.2
	c. to parents	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.4	4.3
	d. to pupils	4.5	4.8	4.1	4.5	4.4
2. Acceptability of COP participants as aides;	a. to faculty	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2
	b. to administration	4.3	4.6	4.1	4.7	4.3
	c. to parents	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.3
	d. to pupils	4.6	4.8	4.2	4.6	4.5
3. Acceptability of COP participants as assistant teachers;	a. to faculty	3.6	4.2	3.9	3.1	3.7
	b. to administration	3.9	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.9
	c. to parents	4.4	4.3	3.8	3.9	4.1
	d. to pupils	4.5	4.7	3.9	4.1	4.3
4. Acceptability of COP graduates as teachers;	a. to faculty	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.2
	b. to administration	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.3
	c. to parents	4.6	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.4
	d. to pupils	4.5	4.7	4.0	4.6	4.4
5. Acceptability of career lattice concept;	a. to faculty	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9
	b. to administration	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1
	c. to parents	4.3	4.5	4.0	3.9	4.1
	d. to pupils	4.3	4.6	3.9	3.6	4.1

*CP=COP participants
CG=COP graduates
CT=Cooperating teachers
SP=School principals
TP=Total population

APPENDIX B

HARTFORD COP EVALUATION ATTITUDE SURVEY

APPENDIX B: HARTFORD COP EVALUATION ATTITUDE SURVEY

Please circle the response consistent with your view of the Hartford Career Opportunities Program.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Questionable or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SA	A	?	DA	SDA

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
1.	The Public Schools have supported COP with sufficient resources.					
	COP Participant (CP)	14	53	25	0	8
	COP Graduate (CG)	23	39	23	15	0
	Cooperating Teacher (CT)	7	40	43	7	3
	School Principal (SP)	8	25	67	0	0
	University Faculty (UF)	12	50	38	0	0
	Total Population (TP)	12	43	37	4	4
2.	COP was a well organized program.					
	CP	41	41	15	0	3
	CG	31	46	0	23	0
	CT	7	27	56	10	0
	SP	23	38	31	0	8
	UF	10	45	27	18	0
	TP	24	40	26	8	2
3.	All participating groups were given the opportunity to participate in the identification of general and specific goals and priorities of COP.					
	CP	18	50	29	0	3
	CG	31	39	15	15	0
	CT	0	13	71	6	10
	SP	8	30	54	0	8
	UF	0	50	31	12	0
	TP	16	34	40	5	5

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
4.	The screening and selection of participants was in keeping with COP goals.					
	CP	11	66	18	5	0
	CG	39	23	23	0	15
	CT	0	13	71	10	6
	SP	8	30	54	8	0
	UF	22	45	22	11	0
	TP	12	39	39	7	3
5.	The idea and existence of a career lattice was never clearly understood by all participating groups.					
	CP	6	17	36	33	8
	CG	8	31	23	38	0
	CT	13	36	45	6	0
	SP	0	15	62	23	0
	UF	10	10	40	20	20
	TP	8	25	39	23	5
6.	All participating groups were asked to evaluate the various phases, activities, and programs of COP.					
	CP	5	34	50	3	8
	CG	8	31	31	22	8
	CT	0	21	52	21	6
	SP	0	23	46	23	8
	UF	0	22	46	23	8
	TP	3	29	44	15	9
7.	Cooperating teachers and University supervisors provided constructive evaluation to participants.					
	CP	11	50	19	17	3
	CG	8	58	34	0	0
	CT	3	32	45	10	10
	SP	0	31	69	0	0
	UF	11	67	11	0	11
	TP	7	45	33	10	5

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
8.	There was effective communication between participants and COP staff.					
	CP	31	54	10	5	0
	CG	31	46	8	15	0
	CT	3	29	42	16	10
	SP	8	15	62	15	0
	UF	22	56	11	0	11
	TP	19	42	24	11	14
9.	If a participant had a problem, he/she knew the proper channels to go through.					
	CP	35	43	7	15	0
	CG	42	33	17	8	0
	CT	6	26	53	12	3
	SP	0	27	73	0	0
	UF	11	67	11	0	11
	TP	20	36	31	11	2
10.	The COP Director and Staff demonstrated effective leadership for the program.					
	CP	50	43	5	2	0
	CG	46	38	8	8	0
	CT	4	21	71	4	0
	SP	14	43	43	0	0
	UF	22	33	45	0	0
	TP	30	36	31	3	0
11.	COP was a severe drain on the participants' time and energy.					
	CP	5	15	21	36	23
	CG	8	8	8	54	22
	CT	3	10	40	34	13
	SP	0	0	50	43	7
	UF	10	30	30	10	20
	TP	7	15	27	34	17

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
12.	Course experiences on the whole were not related to classroom experiences.					
	CP	5	27	11	38	19
	CG	23	15	0	54	8
	CT	0	11	52	37	0
	SP	0	0	60	30	10
	UF	0	13	12	75	0
	TP	5	19	26	41	9
13.	Cooperating teachers provided adequate models of teaching skills.					
	CP	11	65	16	3	5
	CG	46	23	23	0	8
	CT	14	68	18	0	0
	SP	9	73	18	0	0
	UF	10	40	50	0	0
	TP	16	58	21	2	3
14.	The school principal facilitated the success of COP.					
	CP	15	38	38	9	0
	CG	46	8	46	0	0
	CT	11	41	45	3	0
	SP	0	70	20	10	0
	UF	0	12	88	0	0
	TP	16	36	43	5	0
15.	University faculty geared their instruction to the needs of the participants.					
	CP	6	35	29	24	6
	CG	15	15	24	46	0
	CT	4	28	61	7	0
	SP	0	20	80	0	0
	UF	34	58	0	8	0
	TP	10	31	39	18	2

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
16.	Cooperating teachers had more effect on modifying participants' teaching skills than the courses taken by the participants.					
	CP	9	22	29	31	9
	CG	31	15	23	31	0
	CT	7	32	61	0	0
	SP	10	30	50	10	0
	UF	10	0	60	30	0
	TP	14	22	42	19	3
17.	The evaluation feedback from the principals to the participants was an effective component of the program.					
	CP	6	35	50	9	0
	CG	31	15	24	15	15
	CT	0	22	78	0	0
	SP	11	22	67	0	0
	UF	12	0	88	0	0
	TP	10	24	59	5	2
18.	University faculty were interested in and helpful to COP participants.					
	CP	19	51	11	14	5
	CG	31	22	31	8	8
	CT	0	32	68	0	0
	SP	0	44	56	0	0
	UF	34	50	8	0	8
	TP	15	41	34	6	4
19.	COP was not flexible to the individual needs of its participants.					
	CP	6	11	19	47	17
	CG	15	8	15	47	15
	CT	0	14	64	18	4
	SP	0	10	70	20	0
	UF	10	10	20	30	30
	TP	5	12	37	34	12

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
20.	Community participation and involvement were effectively included in COP.					
	CP	8	50	31	8	3
	CG	8	17	50	25	0
	CT	0	15	85	0	0
	SP	0	0	78	22	0
	UF	0	27	46	27	0
	TP	6	28	54	11	1
21.	Cooperative Teachers facilitated communication between participants and principals.					
	CP	9	32	41	12	3
	CG	16	38	38	8	0
	CT	7	29	57	0	7
	SP	0	44	56	0	0
	UF	0	25	63	12	0
	TP	10	32	48	6	4
22.	The University standards set for COP participants were not as high as those for students in the regular teacher-training program.					
	CP	3	11	22	32	32
	CG	8	8	8	22	54
	CT	7	18	61	7	7
	SP	9	9	73	9	0
	UF	0	30	10	50	10
	TP	5	15	34	24	22
23.	COP was able to structure the academic program for the participants so that maximum transfer took place in the classroom.					
	CP	9	31	46	3	11
	CG	8	31	15	38	8
	CT	0	33	63	4	0
	SP	0	10	90	0	0
	UF	22	34	33	11	0
	TP	6	31	49	9	5

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
24.	The evaluation process in the program led to effective learning on the part of the participant.					
	CP	17	66	17	0	0
	CG	38	31	23	8	0
	CT	4	30	66	0	0
	SP	0	44	56	0	0
	UF	0	50	50	0	0
	TP	14	45	40	1	0
25.	The Public Schools provided adequate released time for COP participants to continue their academic studies.					
	CP	8	40	14	24	14
	CG	15	31	15	31	8
	CT	0	37	56	7	0
	SP	9	64	27	0	0
	UF	0	0	56	33	11
	TP	7	36	30	19	8
26.	COP participants should be grouped together for their courses and separated from other students at the University.					
	CP	6	8	11	14	61
	CG	8	0	0	22	70
	CT	0	4	26	40	30
	SP	0	0	50	30	20
	UF	0	19	9	36	36
	TP	5	6	17	26	46
27.	COP participants should be trained in a limited number of selected schools.					
	CP	0	9	20	37	34
	CG	8	0	0	42	50
	CT	11	22	19	29	19
	SP	11	0	22	45	22
	UF	10	40	0	40	10
	TP	6	13	16	37	28

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
32.	COP participants were better prepared for teaching than students going through traditional teacher-training programs.					
	CP	22	56	14	8	0
	CG	34	50	8	8	0
	CT	4	15	41	25	15
	SP	0	20	50	30	0
	UF	0	10	50	20	20
	TP	14	34	28	17	7
33.	COP participants were able to demonstrate adequate teaching skills.					
	CP	17	72	11	0	0
	CG	25	58	0	17	0
	CT	0	69	23	8	0
	SP	0	44	56	0	0
	UF	0	50	40	0	10
	TP	11	64	20	4	1
34.	The present limited number of teacher openings is a valid reason for ending COP.					
	CP	0	8	14	29	49
	CG	8	8	8	26	50
	CT	11	7	32	36	14
	SP	0	11	33	45	11
	UF	0	20	11	50	20
	TP	3	9	20	34	34
35.	The career lattice was a motivating force for participants.					
	CP	18	52	21	6	3
	CG	9	73	0	18	0
	CT	4	44	52	0	0
	SP	0	33	56	11	0
	UF	0	77	23	0	0
	TP	10	51	30	7	2

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
28.	COP participants were unable to participate in campus activities at the University.					
	CP	0	34	23	29	14
	CG	17	42	8	8	25
	CT	0	7	89	4	0
	SP	0	11	89	0	0
	UF	10	30	60	0	0
	TP	3	23	51	14	9
29.	Adequate guidance and counseling was available to participants through COP or University staff.					
	CP	17	53	11	8	11
	CG	25	42	8	25	0
	CT	0	15	74	11	0
	SP	0	11	78	11	0
	UF	10	50	20	10	10
	TP	10	38	37	11	4
30.	Most of the participants assumed the responsibility for designing their own academic program within University requirements.					
	CP	0	38	21	26	15
	CG	17	25	8	42	8
	CT	0	4	77	19	0
	SP	0	10	80	10	0
	UF	0	22	22	45	11
	TP	4	21	40	27	8
31.	Participants were guided to develop their own unique styles of teaching after minimal competencies were accomplished.					
	CP	15	30	34	15	6
	CG	17	41	8	17	17
	CT	0	22	74	4	0
	SP	0	22	78	0	0
	UF	0	27	63	0	0
	TP	8	29	49	10	4

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
36.	Insufficient feedback was available regarding the performance of participants, children, and staff.					
	CP	3	12	52	30	3
	CG	17	33	33	17	0
	CT	7	26	45	22	0
	SP	11	45	33	11	0
	UF	0	33	45	11	11
	TP	5	25	45	22	3
37.	COP was a positive learning experience on the part of all involved.					
	CP	56	44	0	0	0
	CG	42	42	16	0	0
	CT	4	46	32	11	7
	SP	0	50	50	0	0
	UF	30	60	10	0	0
	TP	32	46	17	3	2
38.	Graduates of COP will be more successful than graduates from other teacher education programs.					
	CP	25	29	40	3	3
	CG	33	17	42	8	0
	CT	0	7	37	34	22
	SP	0	0	56	44	0
	UF	0	0	77	23	0
	TP	15	16	44	18	7
39.	The community no longer has a need for a program such as COP.					
	CP	0	0	3	19	78
	CG	0	0	0	25	75
	CT	4	0	38	46	12
	SP	0	11	33	45	11
	UF	0	0	20	50	30
	TP	1	1	17	32	49

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
40.	COP participants were able to function more effectively as teacher aides than were non-COP para-professionals.					
	CP	29	38	18	9	6
	CG	41	17	25	17	0
	CT	11	41	33	15	0
	SP	0	22	33	34	11
	UF	12	12	64	12	0
	TP	23	32	28	14	3
41.	COP participants were on a comparable academic level with other students at the University.					
	CP	18	58	12	12	0
	CG	23	54	15	8	0
	CT	0	15	62	19	4
	SP	0	12	88	0	0
	UF	0	36	9	45	10
	TP	11	40	32	15	2
42.	COP has aided a number of other special programs in the Public Schools.					
	CP	8	35	54	3	0
	CG	8	31	38	23	0
	CT	4	15	81	0	0
	SP	0	25	75	0	0
	UF	0	25	75	0	0
	TP	6	28	62	4	0
43.	COP has increased cooperation between the University and the Public Schools.					
	CP	17	53	24	3	3
	CG	15	77	8	0	0
	CT	0	34	59	7	0
	SP	0	38	62	0	0
	UF	10	60	20	0	10
	TP	12	49	34	3	2

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
44.	Participants did not have an adequate voice in the administration and functioning of COP.					
	CP	6	21	36	34	3
	CG	15	31	34	15	3
	CT	0	7	93	0	0
	SP	0	12	88	0	0
	UF	10	10	50	20	10
	TP	6	17	57	17	2
45.	The Public Schools should make every effort to continue COP in some way.					
	CP	74	24	2	0	0
	CG	75	25	0	0	0
	CT	7	63	23	7	0
	SP	12	25	50	13	0
	UF	30	50	20	0	0
	TP	46	37	14	3	0
46.	COP has improved the self-understanding, self-image and confidence of the participants.					
	CP	68	32	0	0	0
	CG	69	23	8	0	0
	CT	15	62	23	0	0
	SP	28	72	0	0	0
	UF	33	67	0	0	0
	TP	45	45	8	2	0
47.	COP has increased the school community relationship.					
	CP	29	59	9	3	0
	CG	46	39	15	0	0
	CT	0	48	41	7	4
	SP	0	50	50	0	0
	UF	30	40	30	0	0
	TP	22	50	24	3	1

Item #	Item	Responses in Percentages by Sub-Group SA	A	?	DA	SDA
48.	The cost of COP is the major factor which might prohibit its continuance.					
	CP	26	24	29	12	9
	CG	46	39	15	0	0
	CT	0	25	54	21	0
	SP	13	13	74	0	0
	UF	12	25	50	0	13
	TP	17	26	40	13	4
49.	The benefits of COP have not justified the dollars spent.					
	CP	3	12	9	21	55
	CG	8	8	0	38	46
	CT	0	7	41	41	11
	SP	0	0	74	13	13
	UF	0	0	33	56	11
	TP	2	8	22	36	32
50.	Teaching competencies can be better learned in the public schools, than in the college classroom.					
	CP	11	40	20	11	18
	CG	46	36	9	0	9
	CT	15	44	15	19	7
	SP	24	38	38	0	0
	UF	10	30	30	20	10
	TP	17	39	21	12	11
51.	COP has substantially achieved its goals and objectives.					
	CP	17	71	9	3	0
	CG	23	54	15	8	0
	CT	0	27	69	4	0
	SP	0	12	88	0	0
	UF	11	33	56	0	0
	TP	12	47	38	3	0
52.	COP has improved education in the Public Schools.					
	CP	32	54	14	0	0
	CG	46	54	0	0	0
	CT	7	45	37	7	4
	SP	0	38	50	12	0
	UF	11	56	33	0	0
	TP	22	48	25	4	1